

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

58



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,971	12/03/2001	Syed M. Ali	16159.023001; P6425	7806
32615	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

58

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,971

Applicant(s)

SYED M. ALI

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 06/03/2002 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14, 16-19, 22, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumsion et al (6,496,865 B1) in view of APA (Admitted Prior Art).
3. As to claim 1, Sumsion teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system having distributed collaborating systems (a distributed network, col 1, ln 10-14), restricting direct interaction between distributed collaborating (col 2, ln 57-67/col 4, ln 60-67), a application-independent interface (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-46/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67/the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), an application-independent interface between distributed collaborating systems(col 11, ln 9-18/col 1, ln 40-55/col 2, ln 10-20), a service(the client redirector 306, col 11, ln 9-18), invoking a service from the application-independent interface in order to enable interaction between distributed collaborating components(col 11, ln 9-19).
4. Sumsion does not teach the systems as components. However, APA teaches components (system components, page 1, ln 10-12).

Art Unit: 2126

5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion and APA because APA's components would provide a set of functions to the system.

6. As to **claim 2**, Sumsion teaches sending a usage specification to the application independent interface (col 4, ln 60-66).

7. As to **claim 3**, Sumsion teaches the application independent interface has a capability to interpret the usage specification at runtime (col 1, ln 40-46/col 3, ln 18-25/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67 / col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18).

8. As to **claim 6**, Sumsion teaches a service layer (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-45/col 9, ln 1-10/ the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), interposing a service layer between the client and the server (col 9, ln 15-32), the service layer having a capability to interpret a specification from the client at run time in order to enable interaction between the client and the server (col 11, ln 9-19), routing correspondence between the client and server through the service layer(col 11, ln 13-18/ ln 38-43/ln 63-67).

9. Sumsion does not teach the term "routing". However, APA teaches routing (routed, page 2, ln 18-20).

10. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion and APA because APA's routing would transfer the data or information for communication between clients and servers.

11. As to **claim 7**, Sumsion teaches the specification comprises an attribute of an object on the server (col 11, ln 62-64).

Art Unit: 2126

12. As to claim 8, Sumision teaches fetching data from the object based on the specification (col 7, ln 8/ col 10, ln 19-24/ln 60-67 and col 12, ln 60-65).

13. As to claim 9, Sumision teaches storing data fetched from the server in a proxy for the object (col 10, ln 48-50).

14. As to claims 10, 11, APA teaches updating data in the object/ modifying the attribute of the object (page 2, ln 25-28).

15. As to claim 14, Sumision teaches separating specification of usage of an object on the server from implementation of the client (col 10, ln 17-24).

16. As to claim 16, it is an apparatus claim of claim 6; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

17. As to claim 17, Sumision teaches a usage of an object in the server component (col 13, ln 42-46).

18. As to claims 18, 19, Sumision teaches fetching data from the object based on the usage/ updating data in the object based on the usage (col 13, ln 42-48).

19. As to claim 22, it is an apparatus claim of claims 1-2; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claims 1-2 above. In additional, Sumision teaches a server object component having at least one object (resources on the server node 251, col 8, ln 57-58).

20. As to claim 25, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2126

21. Claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumsion et al (6,496,865 B1) in view of APA (Admitted Prior Art) and further in view of Allard et al (US. Patent 6,760,747 B2).

22. As to claim 4, Sumsion and APA do not teach a specification as a logic execution specification. However, Allard teaches sending a logic execution specification (the method to add a book to an order is sent to the server, col 4, ln 44 -46).

23. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion, APA and Allard because Allard's the method to add a book to an order is sent to the server would allows client to specify optional behavior that can be performed by the server.

24. As to claim 5, Allard teaches a logic execution specification (the method to add a book to an order is sent to the server, col 4, ln 44 -46).

25. As to claims 12, 13, Allard teaches invoking a method of an object on the server (col 4, ln 47-51).

26. As to claim 15, Allard teaches separating specification of logic for invoking a method of an object on a server from implementation of client (col 4, ln 47-51). Invoking a method of an object is performed on the server.

27. As to claims 20, 21, 23, they are apparatus claims of claims 12, 13, 5; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 12, 13, 5 above.

28. As to claim 24, Sumsion teaches a application-independent interface (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-46/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67/the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7,

Art Unit: 2126

ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), interpreting a specification (col 1, ln 40-46/col 3, ln 18-25/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67 / col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), client sends the specification (col 1, ln 40-45), a server component that interacts with the service means in order to provide service to the client component(col 11, ln 62-67).

29. Sumsion and APA do not teach a specification as a logic execution specification.

However, Allard teaches sending a logic execution specification (the method to add a book to an order is sent to the server, col 4, ln 44 -46).

30. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion, APA and Allard because Allard's execution specification would allow the server to invoke the function or method from the client.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312 or (571) 272 3767 (new). The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/004,971

Page 7

Art Unit: 2126

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

September 20, 2004



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100